



Meeting Summary

911 Board Standards/Enforcement Committee

08/27/2014

911 Board Office

3514-A Bush St

Raleigh, N.C.

10:00 AM-12:00 PM

<u>Standards Committee</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Guest</u>
Laura Sykora, Chair in person		
Tommy Cole absent	David Dodd present	Brandon Zuidema- by phone
Jimmy Stewart in person	Richard Bradford present	
Barry Furey in person	Richard Taylor present	
Wayne Cyrus by phone	Tina Bone absent	
Christy Shearin in person	Dave Corn present	
Margie Frye absent		
Donna Wright by phone		
Rodney Cates in person		
<u>Enforcement Committee</u>		
Carson Smith in person		
Jeff Dulin- absent		
John Lettney absent		
Greg Foster in person		
Judy Jenkins in person		
Jim Soukup in person		

Laura Sykora called meeting to order at 10:02 AM. Richard Taylor called the roll, and noted that Wayne Cyrus will be retiring, and thanked him for his service and contributions. Laura asked Dave Corn to give a short recap of the last meeting.

Laura moved to a discussion of the draft enforcement process. Step 1 was agreeable to the group. Step 2, the Action Plan, was discussed, with the possibility of adding a time frame for submitting a response to any corrections needed. The Committee agreed that a 30 day period should be sufficient to receive a written response from the PSAP. Barry Furey asked if there needs to be a sunset date as to when the action plan needs to be submitted, and corrections completed. Should there be a

compliance date and who establishes that date? Laura suggested PSAPs should be able to submit an Action Plan within a 60 day time frame. Barry Furey said a 60 to 90 day time frame should be sufficient, but the implementation of the Action Plan may take much longer. If the Action Plan does not address the problem, or resolve the issue, the problem will be presented to the full Standards Committee, as noted in Step 3. Inspectors would have the authority to grant one extension, not to exceed 90 days, to complete the Action Plan. Barry voiced the concern that if the infraction is severe, the time frames being discussed are too lenient. Laura suggested we table the length issue until the Committee discusses the list of infractions.

The discussion then moved to Step 3. Again the time frame issue came up. Should there be a time limit for receiving a response from the PSAP Director, and should there be a time frame for sending a letter to the governing authority, if the PSAP is not working toward compliance? The letter sent to the PSAP Director should include a specific date for receiving a response. Richard Taylor suggested add wording to 3.2 that would say the letter to the PSAP Director will be copied to the City/County Manager, as well as the Finance Director. Greg Foster said this was getting ahead of the game, because this did not give the PSAP Director time to address the problem, before the City/County Manager was notified. Rodney Cates suggested 3.6 be amended to add a link to where the Rules can be found.

The meeting then turned to a discussion of possible infractions, based on the current draft Rules document. Carson Palmer likes the format used to show the infractions as they pertain to the Rules. The question was asked, do we really need to classify the severity of infractions, if the response time to fix the problem will be the same? Barry said not ranking the infractions may make the process easier.

Since the Committee decided they would not rank severity of infractions and treat them all equally, the discussion moved back to the time frame issue. Barry thinks the 30 day response time and the additional 60 days to create the action plan (total of 90 days) should be sufficient. Carson Smith thought more time should be allowed. The Committee decided to go with the original idea that the inspector could grant a one-time extension of up to 90 days. Jim Soukup asked if the PSAP was working on their action plan, would they be considered "in compliance" even if the corrections weren't yet made? The answer was yes, as long as the PSAP is making efforts to address the problems, the Committee is good with that. And with the new legislation, the Board has the ability to withhold a portion of funds if the PSAP is not complying. Christy Shearin hopes the process includes updates from the inspectors to catch problems early, in case the inspection process needs tweaking. This goes back to the first step in the process, who will do the inspections?

The discussion moved back to the checklist process. Richard Bradford said the checklist should be topics, not questions. The wording should not be changed from the original Rules. Several of the Committee members disagreed with this idea. The inspectors need to have a checklist with specific questions to ask. Laura said it seemed best to go through the rules and make sure the questions meet the intent of the rules. Richard Bradford said all the Rules would have to be addressed. Richard Taylor said some of the rules/checklist items would be handled by the inspector prior to a site visit. Christy said to separate the questions by topic, not rule by rule. There could be a section on fiscal topics, a list of operational topics, and any other sections the Committee deems appropriate. Richard Bradford suggested creating a spreadsheet that would include the Rule, the question, and the topics. Any rules not pertaining to the PSAPs do not need to be addressed in the checklist.

The next Standards Committee meeting will be on October 14th, from 10AM-3PM at 3900 Wake Forest Rd.

Laura adjourned the meeting at 1:02 PM.